

# FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

*An analysis of current international events*



1918-1948

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXVIII No. 5

NOVEMBER 12, 1948

## ***U. S. Elections Hearten the Rest of the World***

The aspect of the November 2 elections which made the deepest impression both here and abroad is that the victor was not so much President Truman, great as was his personal triumph in the face of what seemed like hopeless odds, but the American voter, who disregarded the pressure of published predictions and made up his or her own mind on the outstanding issues of our times. In the retrospect of history it will become more clear than it is to-day that in these elections the American voter came of age. No longer are citizens susceptible, as they were in the past, to ballyhoo, to campaign promises of politicians, who in the very moment of making them cheerfully admit they have no intention of carrying them out, and to the sound and fury of words. For men and women who have experienced the anxieties and frustrations of depression and war, words have lost their value, have become demonetized. Actions alone count.

To a degree which seasoned observers recognize as extraordinary, voters scrutinized with care all candidates for office, national, state and local. They gave their support in one instance after another not to old war horses backed by political machines but to men and women, many of them in their thirties and forties, who while running under the banner of the Democratic party had demonstrated independence of mind, personal integrity, and comprehension of the forces at work in the contemporary world. There can be no better prescription for a Republican victory four years hence than to produce a roster of citizens of distinction in various professions sufficiently concerned with the common weal to subject themselves to

### **30th Anniversary of FPA**

Thirty years ago, on the eve of Armistice Day 1918, a group of far-sighted men and women in New York, who had been informally meeting as the "Committee on Nothing at All," founded the Foreign Policy Association. The founders, some of whom are still members of the national Board of Directors, believed the United States had entered the first World War without sufficient knowledge of the issues at stake. Their purpose was to establish an organization that would provide the public with objective nonpartisan information on issues of foreign policy, on the basis of which voters could reach their own conclusions about the course of the United States in world affairs. To this purpose the FPA remains dedicated.

The first FPA luncheon discussion was held in January 1919 on the subject of Russia. In honor of that event National Headquarters will mark the 30th Anniversary of the FPA by a dinner in New York on January 25, 1949. In the interval, articles describing outstanding aspects of the work of the FPA will be published in the *Foreign Policy Bulletin*.

the rough and tumble of politics, such as Estes Kefauver, Paul Douglas, Chester Bowles, Adlai Stevenson, Hubert Humphrey and others. The need to reorganize the party and bring it closer to the people

has been publicly acknowledged since the elections not only by liberal Republicans like Senators Aiken and Flanders of Vermont, but also by Speaker of the House Joseph W. Martin, Jr.

### ***Who Won at the Polls?***

The political analysts and commentators who proved almost one hundred per cent wrong in their predictions of the outcome have since then tried to discover what elements in the national picture they had previously failed to note. Much has been said about two "sleepers" elements—organized labor and organized as well as unorganized farmers—whose pre-election activities and opinions apparently escaped the attention of the daily press. Far less notice has been taken of the role played by women. Yet even superficial observation would have revealed in advance that women—as teachers, as members of an ever widening range of professions, as mothers and wives of men killed or maimed in war or returned to work out their peacetime problems under difficult postwar conditions—have given profound thought to the strains and stresses of both national and international society. Women, by force of circumstances, have to busy themselves with problems of housing, food, education, health, sanitation, and, by projecting what they know of these problems at home, have arrived at many common-sense conclusions about the same problems on the world scene.

What do these elements add up to? The American people clearly rejected both communism and the reactionary philosophy of the Dixiecrats. Some observers have interpreted the results of the elec-

*Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association*

tions as approval of a trend toward "socialism." It is doubtful that most voters saw the issue in such clear-cut terms. A more accurate description would be to say that the vote reflected a great upsurge of personal responsibility for the functioning of this country's political and economic system—a sense of responsibility which, irrespective of what view one may take of other aspects of Franklin D. Roosevelt's Presidency, is a direct heritage of his influence on the younger generation, just as another young generation owed so much to the inspiration for public service of Theodore Roosevelt. Much has been said from pulpits, from university rostrums, from newspaper offices, about the need for instructing the American people in the tenets of democracy. Meanwhile, unheralded, unpublicized, the people had been engaged in the practice of democracy, which is far more effective than any preachment. The era of Woodrow Wilson became known as the era of "the New Freedom." The period in which we live may come to be known as the era of "the new social consciousness."

### ***In Step with the World***

With a striking degree of unanimity, the peoples of other nations have hailed the results of the November 2 elections as a triumph for democracy on two main counts. The Europeans, especially, believe the elections indicate that the United States is in step with changes going on throughout the world; and nations all over the globe interpreted the results as acceptance by the American people of the responsibilities of peacetime international co-operation. The prevailing reaction abroad was well summed up by Anne O'Hare McCormick of the *New York Times*, writing from Paris on November 5, who said: "There was a queer note of satisfaction in the general surprise and it was clear to the eavesdropper that these hard-pressed little people were delighted to see the political prophets confounded and a man marked for defeat

come out ahead. They are looking for miracles and here was a sign that the unexpected can happen, and happen by popular self-assertion." Important, too, in strengthening faith abroad in our democratic process were the good humor and the sense of fairness expressed by the defeated candidates and by the American press, which candidly acknowledged its miscalculations.

Ever since World War I and the spread of industrialization began to alter the political, economic and social pattern of the world which appeared to have been permanently set in the early nineteenth century, it has been evident that the trend of events was moving toward a point somewhat left of center. This trend, greatly accelerated by the depression of the 1930's and World War II, was composed of many factors, among which Marxism, important as it was in molding the thinking both of Socialists and Communists, was itself a result, rather than a cause, of the seismic readjustments within and between nations precipitated by the Industrial Revolution, the rise of nationalism first in Europe, then in other continents, the emphasis on scientific inquiry as contrasted with unquestioning acceptance of traditional concepts.

As this trend toward left of center became crystallized in Western Europe after V-E Day, many thoughtful Europeans began to fear that the United States, because of its vast industrial and financial power, would remain aloof from and perhaps even inimical to change in other countries. This fear was fanned by Russian propaganda, which sought to depict this country as the bulwark of reaction. The November 2 elections not only have served to dissipate this fear among friends of the United States, but will probably prove the greatest victory this country could conceivably win over the U.S.S.R.—a bloodless victory which, without resort to atomic bombs, will have demonstrated that the American people, far from losing the dynamism that has made this country

great in the past, approaches with renewed strength and clarified vision the complex, but by no means insoluble, problems of the twentieth century.

The Soviet leaders, who whether through inadequate information or wishful thinking had to the last moment kept on expecting a large vote for Henry Wallace, have promptly acknowledged their own miscalculation—in face-saving terms. At a meeting celebrating the 31st anniversary of the Russian revolution on November 6, Foreign Minister Molotov declared that the voters of the United States had rejected a program of aggression and reaction, although he continued to denounce plans for a Western European alliance as projects "to prepare new aggressions and the unleashing of new wars."

Immediately after the elections, the question was raised here and abroad whether President Truman would, or should, return to his idea, abandoned during the campaign, of sending a new mission to Moscow—an idea which, in spite of press criticisms, apparently did him no harm among voters. Well-informed observers doubt that a political mission would serve a useful purpose at this particular moment, when the Berlin question is still before the Security Council of the United Nations—although strong support for such a course has been voiced in France by moderate organs like *Le Monde*. Some business groups here, however, as well as some experts on Russian affairs favor the opening of trade negotiations with Moscow, either by sending an American trade mission there or inviting the Kremlin to send a trade mission here—on the theory that now that the ERP is beginning to show results, and the position of the United States in world affairs has become strengthened and stabilized, Russia and its neighbors, all of whom urgently need a wide range of raw materials, tools and machinery for their own reconstruction, may be ready to talk business.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

## ***Basic Problems Remain As Malaya Quells Communists***

Malaya, which since early summer has been the scene of guerrilla fighting and terrorist attacks, presents a picture of extraordinary complexity. Malcolm MacDonald, British Commissioner General for Southeast Asia, according to a report on November 4, assured leaders of the Commonwealth, meeting in London, that communism in the area is being kept un-

der control. Although it is true that overt manifestations of violence in Malaya have declined in frequency, the basic problems giving rise to discontent still persist. So long as this is true, Communists will be tempted to exploit the situation for their own ends.

First among Malaya's difficulties is the economic crisis. The country depends for

its existence on two major products, rubber and tin, normally providing over half the world's supply of the former and about 30 per cent of the latter. With the proceeds Malaya buys food and consumer goods which are indispensable in maintaining the population's livelihood. Since the war, however, tin production has fallen to less than half of the prewar level, primarily

because of inability to replace worn-out machinery, but rubber production now considerably exceeds former levels. The income from tin exports has therefore declined, while a drastic fall in the price of rubber, due to increased competition from subsidized synthetic production and the unrestricted expansion of supply, is having devastating effects on the rubber industry in Malaya. Since the prices of food, especially rice, and consumer goods have meanwhile been rising drastically, a large part of the population faces semi-starvation. Despite the government's attempt to impose rationing, continued smuggling, ineffective price controls and non-co-operation have contributed to general chaos.

Discontent has been increased by the inequality with which economic burdens fall on different sections of the population. The plantation and mine workers, most of whom are Chinese and Indians, despite wage raises of from 300 to 700 per cent, have been most severely hit. By contrast the European plantation owners and the urban commercial and industrial magnates, mostly European and Chinese, although adversely affected by the fall in rubber prices, live at a consumption level far above that of the masses. The indigenous Malay population, for their part, having clung largely to their original peasant farming occupations, are not so severely affected by conditions in the rubber and tin market.

### **Postwar Controversy**

Under these conditions the widespread prevalence of banditry and disorder, against which the British authorities had failed to establish adequate police protection, does not appear surprising. The jungles and swamps of Malaya, moreover, make the task of policing especially difficult. At the core of the unorganized dissident groups are found remnants of the anti-Japanese People's army which had been supplied and aided during the war by the Allies. This guerrilla army consisted largely of Chinese workers strongly hostile to Japan and generally sympathetic to China's Communists. The wealthier urban Chinese, however, generally preferred to get along with the Japanese as best they could, as did the more easygoing Malay people and their Sultans. Many of the Indians were so anti-British that they gave positive aid to the Japanese. When the war ended, it soon became evident that the anti-Japanese army was

now as opposed to British rule as it had been to the Japanese. It also heartily disliked the more well-to-do Chinese who had not fought during the war and now tended to look to the Kuomintang government of China for protection. The guerrillas, furthermore, generally chose to remain in their forest hideouts rather than go back to civilian life since they found that those who did return, while obtaining payment for their arms, were often unable to find employment or other means of support.

Malay's postwar difficulties were further aggravated by the emergence of an acute constitutional issue. On April 1, 1946 the British promulgated a Malayan Union constitution that united the former federated and unfederated Malay States, together with Malacca and Penang which formerly with Singapore constituted the Straits Settlements. This move was made possible by a series of treaties Britain had negotiated the previous autumn with the Sultans of the Malay states, which virtually deprived them of all their powers. The Sultans, upon realizing the implications of the agreements, protested vigorously and enlisted the opposition of a great part of the Malay population. When the British, who had always tended to favor the Malays at the expense of the increasingly numerous immigrant populations, found their chief supporters rising against them, they promptly initiated consultations for a new constitution on a federal basis which was finally adopted and put into effect February 1, 1948.

According to available information, the British did not take local sentiment sufficiently into account in promulgating the Malayan Union or in making the revisions leading to the federation, particularly by not considering sufficiently the interests of the large laboring population, primarily Chinese. This element, whose industry and skill has played a major part in the economic development of the region, has been treated like a group of temporary immigrants. Specifically, the British refusal to incorporate the predominantly Chinese colony of Singapore in the Malay federation keeps the Chinese from exercising a majority influence. Moreover, the British are accused of having failed to take energetic measures to alleviate the economic crisis, by such means as the development of new uses for rubber to compensate for the decline in world demand.

Nevertheless, in justification of the Brit-

ish, it may be pointed out that they have accepted the demands of the Chinese as ultimate objectives, claiming that they will be reached by gradual means and that too rapid a transition would throw the country into chaos and communal strife. Furthermore, many causes of Malaya's difficulties lie completely outside the control of British officials. It should be noted, for example, that the hostility of Chinese Communists toward the Kuomintang, encouraged by Communist successes in China, has led the guerrillas to direct their attacks at well-to-do Chinese as well as at the British.

### **Communist Role**

The extent to which external Communist directives influence the guerrillas is difficult to determine. Malayan Communist leaders now actively in revolt are known to have attended the "Southeast Asia Youth Conference" and Indian Communist party meetings in Calcutta during February 1948, and the Soviet Embassy in near-by Bangkok has been expanded to some forty senior officials although the Russian population of Thailand is said to number only about ten. In mid-July, however, *Izvestia*, organ of the Soviet government, ridiculed the idea that Communists were responsible for the terrorism in Malaya. Observers point out that whether centrally planned or not, these outbreaks may serve Russia's interests by discrediting Britain and the Western powers throughout Asia, reducing supplies of tin and rubber for American and Western European consumption, forcing greater drainage of money, supplies and troops from the United Kingdom, and reducing one of Britain's chief sources of dollar credit. It is also clear that the British will not be successful in eliminating Communist-led terrorism until they have first won the active support of the bulk of the population by measures calculated to bring substantial improvement of their lot.

In evaluating the situation prevailing in Southeast Asia, it is important to keep in mind many specific problems which, while now often discussed in terms of the American-Soviet struggle, are in themselves of long-term and overriding significance. Generally speaking, no dominant economic classes have emerged among the native peoples of this area, although a considerable "intelligentsia" has developed, animated by theoretical programs and personal loyalties and united only by an intense spirit of nation-



alism. The masses tend to be guided more by the personality of a strong leader than by elaborate doctrines. Only as the leaders acquire a stake in maintaining an existing order can they turn from protest to constructive effort. When the development of mutually beneficial trade with the Western nations becomes a vested interest for popularly based, responsible governments in Southeast Asia, the outlook for peace and stability will be improved. Mere opposition to communism in these areas by armed suppression, however necessary in an emergency, aggravates instead of curing the underlying conditions which tend to increase the power of Moscow's attraction.

FRED W. RIGGS

(The last in a series of three articles on Burma, Indonesia and Malaya.)

*Politics Among Nations—The Struggle for Power and Peace*, by Hans J. Morgenthau. New York, Knopf, 1948. \$5.50

In this scholarly and distinguished work the author, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, has written more than a textbook on world politics. He shows a keen insight into the sources and limitations of national power, and the problem of peace in a time when "two inflexible hostile blocs . . . are morally two worlds." An excellent selective bibliography adds to the general value of the work.

*Current Readings on International Relations*, No. 4, edited by Norman J. Padelford. Cambridge, Mass. M.I.T. Publications in International Affairs, 1948.

The latest volume in this series of readings prepared for use in a general course on international relations provides contemporary material relating some of the basic forces in world politics to current problems. The sections on geopolitics, balance of power, nationalism and ideologies, and great power relations should prove particularly useful.

*Europe on the Move, War and Population Changes, 1917-47*, by Eugene M. Kulischer. New York, Columbia University, 1948. \$5.00

In this latest work the prominent demographic authority, who wrote *The Displacement of Population in Europe*, contends that the post-World War I dam on emigration from overpopulated Europe to Siberia and the New World was a basic cause of World War II. Until outlets are found for current migratory pressures, he believes, there can be no stable peace.

*Anatomy of Paradise*, by J. C. Furnas. New York, William Sloane Associates, 1948. \$5.00

Hawaii and the islands of the Pacific are presented by Mr. Furnas in a new light as compared with his predecessors in this field. Combining history, personalities, and ethnic aspects of the islands in the last three centuries, he produces an account that is interesting as well as authentic.

## News in the Making

One major result of the November 2 elections is that Democrats will become chairmen of the key foreign policy committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives when the 81st Congress meets in January. In the main this transfer of authority from the Republicans will simplify the task of President Truman in the formulation of foreign policy, but some chairmanships will go to Democrats who in the past have questioned the policies of Mr. Truman.

**SENATE. Foreign Relations:** former chairman Tom Connally of Texas, advocate of bipartisan foreign policy and strong supporter of the Truman administration, will succeed Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan, who had followed a similar course;

**Armed Services:** Millard E. Tydings of Maryland, Administration supporter who served on the old Naval Affairs Committee but favors a strong air force will succeed Senator Chan Gurney of South Dakota who had recently urged closer relations with General Franco; **Appropriations:** former chairman Kenneth D. McKellar of Tennessee, an influential conservative, is slated to succeed Styles Bridges of New Hampshire, but ill-health may rule him out, in which case Carl Hayden of Arizona, New Dealer, is next in line; **Finance** (reciprocal trade agreements): former chairman Walter F. George of Georgia, a conservative who voted with the Republicans for tax reduction, will succeed Eugene D. Millikin of Colorado; **Banking and Currency** (price control and housing): Burnet R. Maybank of South Carolina will probably succeed Charles W. Tobey of New Hampshire, who has co-operated with the Administration; **Judiciary** (displaced persons): Pat McCarran of Nevada will succeed Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin.

**HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. Foreign Affairs:** former chairman Sol Bloom of New York, vigorous supporter of bipartisanship and the Administration's foreign policy, will succeed Charles A. Eaton of New Jersey; **Armed Services:** Carl Vinson of Georgia, former chairman of the old House Naval Affairs Committee but re-

cently active in supporting a large modern air force, will succeed Walter G. Andrews of New York, who did not seek re-election, but who would have been succeeded by Dewey Short of Missouri, an isolationist, had the Republicans retained control of the House; **Appropriations:** former chairman Clarence Cannon of Missouri, a conservative who nevertheless supported the Roosevelt and Truman administrations on many spending issues, will succeed John Taber of New York; **Rules:** Adolph J. Sabath of Illinois, interventionist and New Dealer, will succeed Leo Allen of Illinois, isolationist; **Banking and Currency:** former chairman Brent Spence of Kentucky, New Dealer, advocate of price control and public housing, will succeed Jesse P. Wolcott of Michigan; **Ways and Means** (reciprocal trade agreements): Robert L. Doughton of North Carolina, a conservative who supported tax reduction, will succeed Harold Knutson of Minnesota; **Judiciary** (displaced persons): Emanuel Celler of New York, active advocate of civil rights and more liberal displaced persons legislation, will succeed Earl C. Michener of Michigan.

## Branch & Affiliate Meetings

NEW ORLEANS, November 16, *Union of the Democracies*, Clarence Streit

PHILADELPHIA, November 16, *How Long Can Two Ideologies Live in One World?* Vera M. Dean, Joseph Barnes

SYRACUSE, November 16, *Anglo-American Relations*, T. V. Smith

HARTFORD, November 17, *Military Aid to Western Europe?* Senator Ralph Flanders

PITTSBURGH, November 18, *The United States and Russia*, Hanson Baldwin

SAN FRANCISCO, November 18, *Economic Recovery of Germany*, Frederick A. Breier

SHREVEPORT, November 18, *Forum Discussion on American Foreign Policy*

DETROIT, November 19, *Is Berlin Essential to the Democracy of Western Europe?* Dr. Marshall Knappen, Eugene Hesz, Col. Bruce Booth, William Baldwin, Margaret Dougherty

CLEVELAND, November 22, *Which Way France?* André Maurois

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXVIII, No. 5, NOVEMBER 12, 1948. Published weekly from September through May inclusive and biweekly during June, July and August by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. BROOKS EMENY, President; HELEN M. DAGGETT, Secretary; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor. Re-entered as second-class matter June 4, 1948, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Four Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.

F. P. A. Membership (which includes the Bulletin), Six Dollars a Year.

Produced under union conditions and composed and printed by union labor.